Robert Katz
630 West Cliveden Street
Philadelphia, PA 19119

June 21, 1994

Mr. Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, MD 21702

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

I recently read your newest book, Case Open. I concur with your view that Gerald Posner's reconstruction of the assassination of President Kennedy is most likely flawed. In particular, I agree with you that James Tague's 1964 testimony that he incurred his face wound after the second or third shot raises serious questions about Mr. Posner's reconstruction. If Mr. Tague was right about the timing of his face wound, Mr. Posner's reconstruction is incorrect.

I do sense, however, an unwillingness on your part to entertain the possibility that Mr. Posner's essential conclusion may be correct even though he may have reached it because of a flawed analysis of the shots that were fired in Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963. In my opinion, there may or may not have been enough evidence to have proved Lee Harvey Oswald guilty of the murder of John F. Kennedy beyond a reasonable doubt. I nevertheless believe that the evidence against Oswald is clear and convincing (if I may be permitted the use of another legal term), and that despite over thirty years of research into the matter there is little evidence either a) that a second assassin fired at President Kennedy or b) that someone put Oswald up to his act.

I start my analysis of the events of November 22, 1963 by noting that several witnesses saw Oswald try to shoot the police officer who arrested him in the Texas Theater. I find it odd, to say the least, that someone would walk into a movie theater at midday armed with a revolver, and that he would try to use the revolver on a police officer. I infer that the reason for Oswald's remarkable behavior at the theater was that he knew he was guilty of one or more serious criminal acts.

I like to think that I am willing to listen to anyone's theory about JFK's assassination. I am, however, inclined to be skeptical of anyone--including Gerald Posner--who asserts that he or she has solved the case. In particular, I am skeptical of the claims--so often made by conspiracy theorists--that one or another piece of evidence is a forgery. I think that such claims are an easy way out of dealing with evidence that does not gibe with the theorist's view of the assassination.

I would be interested to know whether you have worked out a reconstruction of the assassination, and if so, what that reconstruction would be or where I could find it. I have worked out my own reconstruction, which I would be happy to share with you if you are interested. I do not claim that my reconstruction is a be-all and end-all; except for one or two small wrinkles it is not even particularly original. I did, however, try to cover all of the major issues that have been raised by critics of the Warren Commission, including those who believe that conspirators killed JFK, and I think I came up with something that is straightforward and believable, if not necessarily provable beyond a reasonable doubt.

You may be interested to know that my father is a friend of Arlen Specter's. I first became interested in JFK's assassination as a child when I was taken to Mr. Specter's house; there, in the den, Mr. Specter had all twenty-four volumes of the Warren Commission Report. I spent hours poring over those volumes while my parents were socializing with the Specters. My acquaintance with Mr. Specter (which is now limited; I have seen him perhaps four or five times in the last fifteen years) does not lead me to take everything he says about the assassination at face value; indeed, I am inclined to be skeptical of his views because I know he can make a mistake just like anyone else!

Just so that you know, I am in the construction and housepainting business here in Philadelphia. My academic training is in history; I also attended law school for two years but did not care for the law and dropped out to engage in my present line of work.

I hope all is well in Frederick.

Sincerely yours,

Robert Katz